



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/328,667	06/09/1999	RADHIKA R. ROY	2685/113394	7119
26652	7590	01/12/2004	EXAMINER	
AT&T CORP. P.O. BOX 4110 MIDDLETOWN, NJ 07748			DUONG, DUC T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2663	22
DATE MAILED: 01/12/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/328,667

Applicant(s)

ROY, RADHIKA R.

Examiner

Duc T. Duong

Art Unit

2663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-27, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galasso et al (U.S. Patent 6,374,302 B1).

Regarding to claims 1, 11, and 21, Galasso discloses an apparatus for communication (Fig. 2) employing a plurality of gatekeepers comprising a processor (col. 5 line 39) and a memory (inherent) coupled to said processor, and said memory storing instructions adapted to be executed by said processor for receiving at a first gatekeeper 550 (US master gatekeeper) a request for information (Fig. 3 col. 7 lines 48-50); determining whether the information known by the first gatekeeper (Fig. 3 col. 3 lines 62-64); sending the request via at least one intermediate gatekeeper 570 (global master gatekeeper) to a second gatekeeper 560 (Europe master gatekeeper) if the information is not known by the first gatekeeper (Fig. 3 col. 7 lines 50-55, if the address is outside the US administrative domain coverage queried the global master gatekeeper, which in turn queried the Europe master gatekeeper); receiving the requested information from the second gatekeeper via at least one intermediate gatekeeper wherein a hierarchical level associated with said first gatekeeper is different from a hierarchical level associated with said intermediate gatekeeper (Fig. 3 col. 3 lines

Art Unit: 2663

52-67, implies the higher master gatekeeper (global) has a different hierarchical level than the US master gatekeeper); sending the requested information to a third gatekeeper (zone gatekeeper) wherein the first gatekeeper and the third gatekeeper are located in the same domain (Fig. 3 col. 4 lines 42-44) and wherein said request was received from said third gatekeeper (Fig. 4 col. 7 lines 62-64).

Glasso fails to teach for the first gatekeeper and the third gatekeeper are of a same hierarchical level.

However, to arrange the first gatekeeper (US master gatekeeper) and the third gatekeeper (zone gatekeeper) of a same hierarchical level would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art for scaling the administrative domain coverage, meaning the domain coverage will be scale between the US master gatekeeper and zone gatekeeper.

Regarding to claims 2, 12, and 22, Galasso discloses storing the received information in at least one of the first, intermediate and second gatekeepers (Fig. 2 col. 5 lines 30-36).

Regarding to claims 3, 13, and 23, Galasso discloses determining the next gatekeeper in the gatekeeper-level path to the requested information (Fig. 3 col. 5 lines 2-7).

Regarding to claims 4, 5, 14, 15, 24, and 25, Galasso discloses the information includes an application address and resource information (col. 5 lines 50-57, Table 1).

Regarding to claims 6, 16, and 26, Galasso discloses sending the received information to a requesting entity (Fig. 6 col. 7 lines 64-67).

Art Unit: 2663

Regarding to claims 7, 17, and 27, Galasso discloses attempting to connect to a called entity using information contained in the information (Fig. 6 col. 8 lines 1-8).

Regarding to claims 9, 19, and 29, Galasso discloses the first gatekeeper is an inter-zone gatekeeper (Fig. 2 col. 4 lines 46).

Regarding to claims 10, 20, and 30, Galasso discloses plurality of zone gatekeeper can configured into a domain (col. 3 lines 54-56).

3. Claims 8, 18, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galasso in view of Sengodan (U. S. Patent 6,426,945 B1).

Regarding to claims 8, 18, and 28, Galasso discloses all the limitation with respect to claims 1, 11, and 21, except for determining whether a hop-count field has been set to zero and if the hop-count field has been set to zero, dropping the received information.

However, Sengodan discloses a request message (Fig. 4) includes a hope count field uses to determine whether the message propagates further or not, by if the resulting values is not zero the message is forwarded to the next destination or else it is not forwarded (col. 6 lines 41-49).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to include a hop-field count as taught by Sengodan in Galasso's system with the motivation facilitate inter-gatekeeper communication, wherein gatekeepers discover other gatekeepers and register with one or more of them.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed October 17, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding to Applicant's argument on page 8, if the zone gatekeeper would be brought up to be at the same hierarchical level as the US master gatekeepers the two gatekeepers would not be requesting or delivering information to one another is directed to col. 3 lines 52-53. Herein, Galasso discloses a master gatekeeper can queries another master gatekeeper to resolve an address. Thus, based on the reason set forth in the above, the rejection remains held.

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2663

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc T. Duong whose telephone number is 703-605-5146. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (8:30 AM-5:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau T. Nguyen can be reached on 703-308-5340. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600.

DD

December 30, 2003



STEVEN H. D. NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER